DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 476 UD 016 867

AUTHOR Collins, Erik
TITLE Remedial Reading Skills; Umbrella I, Summer, 1975.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 32p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-61613

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *High School Students; *Reading Programs; Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading; *Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This is an evaluation report of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The program provided remedial reading instruction for 776 economically and educationally disadvantaged high school students at five sites in four high schools. The program was staffed by 17 experienced remedial reading teachers and 17 aides. Numerous site visitations were made by teacher trainers, and frequent teacher training sessions were held. The Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), Advanced Level;: Word Knowledge and Reading Comprehension, was administered to all students. Alternative forms of the test were used as pre and posttest measures. An analysis of the data showed that the students made statistically significant gains in reading achievement. Corollary objectives, the means of achieving these objectives, and the results are also contained in this report. Program objectives were met. (Author/BS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137476

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-61613

Remedial Reading Skills
Umbrella I
Summer, 1975

Erik Collins, Ph.D.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An evaluation of a New York City School District educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for Summer, 1975

UD016867

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I: THE PROGRAM	1
Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	3
Chapter III: FINDINGS	6
Chapter IV: Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	15
Observer Checklist	Appendix A
Teacher Questionnaire	Appendix B
MIR and Data Loss Form	Appendix C

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.	*Comparison of Pupil Pre/Post Grade Equivalent Means on the Metropolitan Achievement Test*	7
Table 2.	*Distribution of Pupil Pre/Post Fail/Master on Instructional Objectives*	7
Table A.	*Distribution of Pupil Non-Mastering on Pretest and No Posttest Follow-up*	8
Table B.	*Distribution of Pupil Mastery of Instructional Objectives Prior to Instruction*	8
Table C.	*Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objective As a Result of Instruction*	9
Table D.	*Distribution of the Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction*	10
Table E.	*Distribution of Percentage of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Instructional Objectives*	11

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM

Remedial reading instruction was provided for 776 students at 5 sites in 4 high schools. There was an evening program at 1 high school. Initially, the participating economically and educationally disadvantaged students were expected to meet either of the following criteria: (1) January or June 1975 graduation with a certificate instead of a diploma, or (2) entry of the 10th, 11th or 12th grades in September 1975 with reading achievement below the 8.0 level as measured by a standardized test. The second criterion was modified, however, to include only students entering the 11th or 12th grade with reading achievement below the 8.0 level. Qualified students were enrolled primarily on the basis of referrals from their high schools, with voluntary enrollments by students and enrollments through recommendations by teachers.

The purpose of the program was to help the total group of students perform at a significantly higher level on the standardized reading test on the posttest, and to help 70% of the students at one site achieve mastery of an instructional objective which they had not mastered on the pretest. The primary goal of the pupils, however, appeared to be to achieve on an 8.0 level by the conclusion of the program.

17 experienced and well qualified remedial reading teachers were recruited, together with 17 aides. Quantities of appropriate reading materials were purchased, and the principals, reading coordinators and supervisors of the site schools were requested to make available specified reading materials through the summer school general assistant. The reading program itself appeared to be

carefully planned and supervised. Prior to the July 1, 1975 training session and first day of school the following correspondence was sent to the indicated individuals:

Date	To	Subject
5/7/75	TIC of Title I Summer day and evening H.S.	Time and place events of the summer program, materials and equipment
5/22/75	Principals of H.S.	Request for cooperation on the Special Application Form for students
5/23/75	TIC of Day, Evening H.S.	Special Application Form for students
5/29/75	Principals of Title I site schools	Request for the use of Title I labs and reading materials in the summer program
6/9/75	H.S. Principals	Revised list of sites and criteria
6/13/75	Selected students	Notification/request for acknowledgement; site of training session
6/19/75	TIC, General Assistants	Assignments of teachers, paraprofessionals, lists of materials ordered for the summer program.

At the July 1 training session, each teacher received a shopping bag (with the teacher's name on it) containing the following materials: MAT (everything needed), profile sheets, taxonomy, guide to grade level materials, mini-taxonomy, materials guide, assignment sheets, uniform answer sheets, conversion tables, student interview, independent reading record, folders, and blank cassettes. The coordinator gave an overview of the program, reviewed all activities including classroom, MAT and evaluation, and introduced all personnel including the consultant-evaluator.

During the program, each teacher was visited at least once weekly, usually by the teacher trainer. These visits served as both supervision (goal clarification, individualization, use of

materials) and administration/problem-solving. There were 29 teacher sessions from July 1, 1975 to August 8, 1975, one of the last days being a double session (testing, scoring, recording) and 27 student sessions, July 1, 1975 to August 7, 1975. Each class was 90 minutes long, and class size was approximately 15 pupils.

Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The overall purpose of the evaluation was to determine product and process effectiveness for the program within the context of the project proposal and evaluation design. Product effectiveness was measured through "hard" data on student pre/post achievement on a standardized test. Process effectiveness included the relationship between actual and proposed program activities together with certain other qualitative data and was measured through site visits and teacher filled out questionnaires.

Evaluation Objectives

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Remedial Reading Program, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real post-test score and the anticipated post-test score.

NOTE: This objective was modified, as specified by the following quote from the memorandum of June 16, 1975 from Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni to Mr. Milton Schleyen:

" . . . a correlated t test will be applied to determine if the difference between pre/post test grade equivalent means is statistically significant."

All students in the program were given the following batteries of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Advanced level: Word Knowledge and Reading Comprehension. Form H was given as the pretest during the first week of the program (July 1 - 3) and Form F was

given as the posttest during the last week of the program (August 5). The tests were scored by the teachers and entered as grade equivalent scores on the data collection form. Of the 776 students for whom names were entered on the data collection forms, pre and post test scores were available for 635. The breakdown on the discrepancy between total N and number tested is as follows: a total of 138 students were absent from post test, 100 or 72.5% of whom were discharged or had withdrawn. 3 non-English speaking students were not tested on either or both pre and post test. Of the 635 students for whom pre and post test scores were available, only 36 or 5.6% had attendances of less than 75%.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the participants will demonstrate mastery of at least one instructional objective, which prior to participation in the program, they did not master (exploratory; not part of evaluation).

All students in the program at Theodore Roosevelt High School were administered a criterion referenced test (C.R.T.) developed by SRA on a pre/post test basis during the second (week of July 7-11) and last (week of August 4 - 8) week of the program. There were 5 areas covered, phonics, structural analysis, comprehension, vocabulary and study skills, with 3 objectives for each area (15 objectives) and 3 items for each objective. The pretest was to have been given during the first week of the program, but a miscue in shipping resulted in the test being delivered to the teachers during the second week. The tests were scored and recorded by program personnel in the pass/fail mode (pass was defined as 3 out of 3 correct) by pupil and instructional objective on the Class Evaluation Record (C.E.R.) provided by the Office of Educational Evaluation. Data relevant to the evaluation objective were

summarized from the C.E.R. Complete pre/post test information was available for 146 out of the 160 students for whom pretest scores were recorded. Of the 14 pupils absent, 11 had been discharged prior to the posttest.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which the pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives (Exploratory).

The evaluative instrument, dates of the evaluative procedures, scoring and summarization are the same as for Evaluation Objective #2.

Evaluation Objective #4: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Two evaluative instruments, an observer checklist and a teacher questionnaire, were developed with regard to this objective. These were developed following a study of the program proposal and evaluation design, interviews with the program coordinator and teacher trainer on July 1 and 2, and attendance at the teacher training (orientation) session on July 1.

In summary, the program was to offer rather intensive attention to the variety of reading problems which this particular group of students could be expected to present. The time available was rather limited. The teachers and educational assistants would have to be competent and have the necessary materials as of the beginning of the program. The evaluative instruments were developed so as to measure on the basis of the following criteria: competent teachers (experience plus training), adequate physical facilities and materials, teacher planning and evaluation with respect to individual diagnosis, prescription and remediation, the use of appropriate word attack skill tasks, comprehension skills,

interpretation, reading rate activities, independent use of materials, rapport with students, and ready access to and regular consultation with the High School Reading Office. Site visits were made on July 9, 28, 29 and 30, 1975. During the site visits, each teacher was observed and the observations recorded on the observer checklist. 2 teachers were not observed teaching per se, as they were administering the C.R.T. which had arrived late. The teacher questionnaire was given to the teachers during the site visits and were mailed in, anonymously, by 16 out of the 17 teachers. An additional check on teacher planning and evaluation was an examination of the individual student folders and the teacher's response to the general question of "how do you determine what assignments to make for this student?"

Chapter III: FINDINGS

In the first section of this chapter, findings are presented with respect to the objectives specified in the evaluation design as measured by the evaluative procedures described in the previous chapter. The following sections include a description of the adequacy of facilities and materials, a discussion of the extent to which the program serviced the needs of the specific target population for which it was designed and implementation of the recommendations from the last prior study. Because of the cutbacks, there was little need to integrate with other district programs.

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Remedial Reading Program, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between pre/post test grade equivalent means through the correlated t test methodology.

Findings shown in Table 1, following, indicate a significant gain in achievement for students in the program. Findings for

total scores only are reported in the MIR; findings for pupil achievement on the subscales of word knowledge and reading comprehension are also included in Table 1. With rather striking gains during the program of 9, 8 and 8 months, all significant at the .001 level, the students' achievement unequivocally met the first objective. This component should qualify as an exemplary program.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF PUPIL PRE/POST GRADE EQUIVALENT MEANS ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Section	Pretest $\bar{M}$	Pretest SD	Posttest $\bar{M}$	Posttest SD	t value	df	p less than
Word Knowledge	6.1	1.7	7.0	1.9	13.1	634	.001
Reading Comprehension	5.9	1.8	6.7	2.0	8.8	634	.001
Total	6.0	1.6	6.8	1.8	15.5	634	.001

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the participants will demonstrate mastery of at least one instructional objective, which prior to participation in the program, they did not master.

As indicated in Table 2, following, 70.5% of the participating pupils actually mastered two of the instructional objectives on the posttest which they had failed on the pretest. Since 85.6% of the pupils mastered one objective on the posttest which they had failed on the pretest, the second objective was also met.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL PRE/POST FAIL/MASTER ON INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

No. of objectives fail/master pre/post	No. of students	Cumulative no. of students	Cumulative % of students
15	1	1	0.7%
14	0	1	0.7

Table 2 continued

No. of objectives fail pre/ master post	No. of students	Cumulative no. of students	Cumulative % of students
13	0	1	0.7%
12	0	1	0.7
11	0	1	0.7
10	0	1	0.7
9	2	3	2.1
8	2	5	3.4
7	7	12	8.2
6	9	21	14.4
5	15	36	24.7
4	26	62	42.5
3	16	78	53.4
2	25	103	70.5
1	22	125	85.6
0	21	146	100.0%

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which the pupils demonstrate mastery of the instructional objectives (exploratory).

The findings shown in Tables A and B, following, indicate that a relatively small number of pupils demonstrated either all or none mastery and that most of the pupils were clustered in the mid-range of pretest mastery/failure.

TABLE A

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL NON-MASTERY ON PRETEST AND NO POSTTEST FOLLOW-UP

Number of Instructional Objectives Failed*	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
9-10	27	16.5%
7-8	46	28.0
5-6	35	21.3
3-4	18	11.0
1-2	2	1.2
0	1	0.6%

TABLE B

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES PRIOR TO INSTRUCTION

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
75-100%	13	8.1%
51-75%	70	42.7
26-50%	57	35.6
0-25%	23	14.4

*Does not refer to pupil non-mastery of 11+ objectives.

The findings shown in Table C indicate which instructional objectives were attempted and mastered by various numbers of students. The assumption for the following discussion is that if an instructional objective was not entered in the "skills not covered" column on the class evaluation record for the CRT, the teacher had taught (and the student had attempted) the objective.

TABLE C

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION*

Instructional Objective	Ratio of # pupils achieving mastery / # pupils attempting mastery	Percentage of Mastery
1	19/145	13.1%
2	36/134	26.9
3	37/132	28.0
4	23/146	15.8
5	26/146	17.8
6	40/146	27.4
7	32/146	21.9
8	29/146	19.9
9	34/146	23.3
10	15/146	10.3
11	10/146	6.8
12	42/113	28.8
13	33/146	22.6
14	35/112	31.3
15	32/135	23.7%

Objectives 1, 4-11 and 13 were attempted by 95% or more of the students, while objectives 12 and 14 were attempted by only 77% of the pupils. The success rates were much lower, however, with most of the ratios of mastery over attempted being in the 20-29% range. Of the objectives in which the success ratios were the highest, only objectives 9, inference, and 13, book organization, were among the objectives attempted by most of the students. It would appear that although most of the objectives were attempted by most of the pupils (and teachers), only some of the objectives were mastered by some of the pupils.

* Table C refers to pupils attempting, as defined above, not total number passing/failing.

The findings shown in Table D parallel those shown in Table 2. Most of the pupils mastered but a few of the instructional objectives.

TABLE D

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION

Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
15	1	0.7%
13-14	0	0.0
11-12	0	0.0
9-10	2	1.4
7-8	9	6.2
5-6	24	16.4
3-4	42	28.8
1-2	47	32.2
0	21	14.4

With regard to the data illustrated on Table E, each pupil for whom pre/post data are available took the complete CRT and all pupils could therefore be described as having attempted all objectives. However, since data on the class evaluation record indicate that some objectives were not covered with some students, the number of objectives attempted was defined as the number of objectives failed on the pretest, less the number of objectives not covered by the teacher.

Consequently, the number of objectives actually attempted by each pupil varied, but tended to be rather low. A frequency distribution of the numbers of pupils attempting from all to none of the objectives is not indicated on the table, but the range was from 1-13, with a median number of objectives attempted of 7.

TABLE E

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS ACHIEVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives *# Objectives Achieved / # Objectives Attempted*	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
90-100%	6	4.1%
80-89%	9	6.2
70-79%	9	6.2
60-69%	21	14.4
50-59%	30	20.5
40-49%	15	10.3
30-39%	10	6.8
20-29%	14	9.6
10-19%	12	8.2
0-9%	20	13.7

In summary, pupil mastery tended to be of a subset of the instructional objectives, clustered around 50%, whether the ratio was 5/10 or 1/2.

Evaluation Objective #4: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

The Observer Checklist (Appendix A) and the Teacher Questionnaire (Appendix B) were developed so as to measure the program as described in the Project Proposal and modified as a result of the budget crisis. The findings shown in Tables 3 and 4 indicate that the desired qualities were present in the classrooms and behaviors observed, with the exception of the materials requested of the site high schools. One of the project coordinator's goals was to recruit competent teachers, and the observed teacher planning, evaluation and teaching certainly approximated the qualities envisaged by the proposal. Class sizes were approximately 15, with the indicated activities taking place on an individualized basis. The teacher trainer or project coordinator visited each

teacher at least once weekly and the only discrepancies from the proposal were the revised selection criteria and the problem with securing materials from the host schools. The program was observed to coincide with the description in the project proposal.

Adequacy of facilities and materials. Facilities were relatively adequate. As indicated by item A on the Observer Checklist (Appendix A), the following qualities were observed for all 17 classrooms: size of area adequate, space available for small group work, space available for individual work, storage facilities available, chalkboard available, area attractive and adequate physical provisions (light, ventilation, etc.). The median overall rating of facilities was 4 on a 5-point, Likert-type scale. With regard to materials, however, the picture was somewhat mixed. On item B, Materials, a majority of materials specified to be left for use was not available for the teacher for 16 out of 17 classrooms although the materials ordered for the summer program were available for 14 out of the 17 classrooms. The median overall rating of materials was 4 on a 5-point scale. Items 13 through 16 on the Teacher Questionnaire also relate to materials. 14 out of the 16 reporting teachers described the supply of materials as adequate, the median rating being 4 on a 5-point, Likert-type scale, although 14 out of the 16 teachers reported supplementing the prescribed materials with materials from other sources. Only 3 of the teachers described themselves as having found it necessary to create their own reading materials. The materials and labs observed in use were appropriate for the program (labs such as R.F.U., S.R.A., E.D.L.; paperbacks, Daily News, games). It would appear, however, that the High School Reading Office did a much

better job of supplying the teachers with materials than the host schools. Facilities and materials were concluded to be adequate.

Needs of the target population. It would appear that there were two needs for the target population, first, to attain an 8.0 in reading achievement, and second, to attain a higher level of achievement in reading. As indicated by the mean pre/post MAT scores, the population scored well below grade level in reading achievement, and did demonstrate significant gains. Individualized instruction was used throughout, and student assignments/records in folders were related to specific needs (speed, comprehension, vocabulary, etc.). Of the 635 students for whom pre/post information was available, 140 or 22% actually attained an 8.0 level or higher who had not attained 8.0 on the pretest. This program does appear to be serving the needs of the target population, and did meet an important need for a significant percentage.

Implementation of recommendations from last prior study. There were 7 recommendations from the last prior study. These are discussed in sequence, beginning with the first. 1. Seek to recruit superior reading teachers: on the basis of the observed results, it would appear that superior teachers were selected. Data from items 1-5 on the Teacher Questionnaire indicate that the credentials of the teachers were good, e.g., 2 were at the B.A. level, 5 at the M.A. level and 9 at the M.A.+ level, although only 2 had had a major in reading; most reported specialized training, median years of experience in teaching reading of 5 years in high school, 6 years in junior high school and 5 years in elementary school with considerable other experience in teaching reading. Appropriate items on the Observer Checklist were items E. Teaching

Procedures, F. Teaching Behavior and G. Pupil Participation. The teachers were observed to be using the desired procedures and exhibiting the desired teacher behaviors and the pupils were observed to be exhibiting the desired behaviors, with median ratings of 4 on a 4-point scale for all ratings. One frequent suggestion by the teachers, however, was to employ experienced paraprofessionals. 2. Set up calendar and guidelines in June at home schools: This recommendation was also implemented, as indicated by the summary of correspondence in Chapter I. Correspondence with the home schools relevant to the recommendation actually began May 7. 3. Seek a pre-selection process through school year for graduates and juniors reading below 8.0 to prepare their summer enrollment: There is no data bearing directly on this point, but there appears to be less than optimal cooperation with the high schools, for example, the specified reading materials were not shared. Without referring specifically to this point, during the July 2 interview with the program coordinator it became evident that the high schools typically do not presently send the requested supportive data for each enrollee. 4. Establish a uniform credit system for reading: Discussion continued; the recommendation appears to be somewhat outside the scope of a summer program. 5. Seek to eliminate necessity for "doubling up" by providing backups for immediate replacement for sick staff: Substitute time was provided for in the budget; one aide absence was observed without a substitute. 6. Try to eliminate over-testing: All tests given were SED requirements. 7. Materials need to be in place before program starts: This issue has been discussed earlier. The only materials not in place on time were the materials to be supplied by the host schools and the CRT.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Three major overall events were noted. First, the pupils in the program were observed to demonstrate rather striking achievement, with 22% actually attaining the desired 8.0 in reading achievement. Second, with regard to pupil mastery of objectives, while the objective of 70% of the pupils attaining at least one objective was met, actual mastery was of a subset of the total number of objectives. Third, the program coincided with the description in the proposal.

Conclusions

1. The summer program personnel were highly competent, with the possible exception of lack of experience hindering the performance of some of the paraprofessionals.
2. The program needs more experience with CRT before useful expectations can be specified in an evaluation design.
3. The summer program needs more cooperation from the sending high schools.
4. Title I money was well invested in this program.

Recommendations

1. The program should be refunded and further supported (additional materials; increased cooperation with the high schools) if possible.
2. A mechanism should be developed (competency-based certification would be one possibility) to facilitate the selection and employment of reading personnel as competent as the observed staff.
3. The M.A.T. which is given pre/post is not a diagnostic test,

although the staff was able to so use it on a limited basis. The use of a diagnostic pre/post test would have the same instrument serve both an evaluative and diagnostic function and is recommended.

4. Paraprofessionals experienced in remedial reading should be selected (the aides observed were conscientious; for the short duration of the program, however, there was not really time for them to learn)

Remedial Reading Skills, Umbrella I, Summer, 1975

Function Number: 09-61613

Use Table 28 for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 26. (See "Instructions" Item 5 before completing this table.)

28. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary. [27]

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested		Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data		Subgroup 9/
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post			4/ N	5/	Date	Mean	6/ SD	Date	Mean	6/ SD	7/ Test	8/ Value	
6 0 8 1 6	72 0	MAT71	H	F	Adv.	Adv.	776	16	635	1	7/2	6.0	1.8	8/15	6.8	1.8	t	15.5	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.

5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = Standard score (publisher's); 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.

6/ SD = Standard Deviation

7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).

8/ Obtained value

9/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

30. **Criterion Referenced Test Results:** In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests. Exploratory purposes only. Not part of evaluation. Erik Collins - consultant-evaluator

29

: Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2102	Beginning conson.	SRA	10-12	60816		119	27	19	8
2106-7	Long vowels	SRA	"	"		80	66	36	30
2105	Initial blends	"	"	"		72	74	37	37
2201	Compound words	"	"	"		106	40	23	17
2202	Contractions	"	"	"		101	45	26	19
2204	Prefixes	"	"	"		83	63	40	23
2404	Details	"	"	"		75	71	32	39
2406	Main idea	"	"	"		34	112	29	83
2403	Inference	"	"	"		42	124	34	90
2304	Synonyms	"	"	"		18	28	15	13
2501	Antonyms	"	"	"		32	14	10	4
2503	Geography	"	"	"		31	115	42	73
2501	Book organization	"	"	"		44	102	33	69
2502	Guide words	"	"	"		44	102	35	67

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.

2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests. Exploratory purposes only. Not part of evaluation. Erik Collins - consultant-evaluator

29

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2407	Maps	SRA	10-12	60816		55	91	32	59

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.
2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM
Umbrella I

Erik Collins, Ph.D.
ECRC/UMES, Princess Anne, MD 21853

Observer Checklist

School *(all sites)* Teacher *N=17*

	YES	NO
A. Physical Facilities		
1. Size of area adequate	*17*	
2. Space available for small group work	*17*	
3. Space available for individual work	*17*	
4. Storage facilities adequate	*17*	
5. Chalkboard available	*17*	
6. Area attractive	*17*	
7. Adequate physical provisions (lights, ventilation, etc.)	*17*	

Overall Rating of Facilities	1	2	3	4	5
	0	*0*	*4*	*13*	*0*

	YES	NO
B. Materials		
1. Majority of materials specified to be left for use (list) available for teachers	*1*	*16*
2. Materials ordered for summer program (list) available for teachers	*14*	*3*

Overall Rating of Materials	1	2	3	4	5
	0	*0*	*2*	*12*	*1*

	YES	NO
C. Evaluation		
1. Use of Informal Reading Inventory	*14*	*3*
2. Metropolitan Achievement Test upon admission to program	*17*	
3. On-going informal evaluation of errors in word recognition	*17*	
4. On-going diagnosis of errors in comprehension	*17*	
5. Evaluation of deficiencies in study skills	*17*	

Overall Rating of Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
	0	*0*	*4*	*8*	*5*

	YES	NO
D. Planning		
1. Evidence of planned sequence in skill development	*12*	*5*
2. Planning of skill lessons based on on-going diagnosis of deficiencies	*17*	
3. Evidence of planned varied activities for individual and small group needs	*15*	NA=
4. Application materials and assignments differentiated for individual and small group needs	*17*	

Overall Rating of Planning	1	2	3	4	5
	0	*0*	*6*	*7*	*5*

	YES	NO
E. Teaching Procedures *NA = 2*		
1. Use of individualized approach in reading class	15	
2. Evidence of folder or contract system in use	15	
3. Teacher working one-to-one with students as needed	15	
4. Weekly report on student progress by teacher or student	15	
5. Variety of simultaneous reading activities is evidence	15	
6. Immediate reinforcement of success	15	
7. Specific skill teaching in		
a. Phonetics, structural analysis, decoding	15	
b. Context clues	15	
c. Word study	15	
8. Specific skill teaching in comprehension skills and interpretation	15	
9. Specific skill teaching in reading rate, e.g.		
a. Application of appropriate rate	15	
b. Increasing reading rate	15	
10. Exercises differentiated to include various types of meanings--literal, interpretive, critical evaluation	15	
11. Grouping of pupils (small group or individual) for special needs	15	
12. Procedures appropriate to maturity and ability of pupils	15	
13. Use of class time: pacing, variety of activities	15	

Overall Rating of Teaching Procedures	1	2	3	4	5
	0	0	3	12	2

	YES	NO
F. Teaching Behavior		
1. Appears enthusiastic	17	
2. Establishes a good rapport with pupils (relaxed, informal, confident)	17	
3. Encourages all pupils to participate	17	
4. Instills confidence in pupils--uses positive reinforcement)	17	

Rating of teacher's self-confidence	1	2	3	4	5
	0	0	3	9	5

Rating of teacher's utilization of skill	1	2	3	4	5
	0	0	2	13	2

	YES	NO
G. Pupil Participation		
1. Actively respond during reading period	15	
2. Interact with each other	3	NA
3. Show interest in independent reading	15	
4. Able to work independently with skills material	15	
5. Students appear to be working on individual skills according to diagnosis	15	
6. Indication by students of their awareness of their own relative strengths and weaknesses in reading	15	

Degree of self-direction exhibited by students	1	2	3	4	5
	0	0	1	12	4

Degree of self-confidence exhibited by students	1	2	3	4	5
	0	0	0	15	2

SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM
Umbrella I

Erik Collins, Ph.D.
ECRC/UMES, Princess Anne, MD 21853

Teacher Questionnaire

Please circle the appropriate answers, filling in information where necessary. Please turn in the sealed envelope on August 8. Neither you nor your school is identified.

1. What is your present level of education? *(N = 16)*

   a. B.A. *2*
   b. M.A. *5*
   c. M.A.+ *9*

2. Did you have a major in reading at any time?

   a. Yes *2*
   b. No *14*

3. Have you taken other specialized training in remedial reading (inservice, college, other)?

   Yes = 14
   No = 2

   Inservice 7

   College (Graduate Studies) 8

   Workshops 4

4. How many years have you taught reading

   a. in high school? ___ *2-14, Md = 5 (N=16)*
   b. in junior high school? ___ *2-7, Md = 6 (N= 8)*
   c. in elementary school? ___ *1-5, Md = 5 (N= 3)*

5. What other experience do you have in teaching reading, other than that listed above?

   Tutoring, Teaching English in Junior High School, High School, Alternative Schools, ESL, Summer Programs, Evening Programs, College Preparatory, Community College, Own Children

6. Do you have a separate room for your classes?

   a. Yes *16* c. N/A *0*
   b. No *0*

7. What is the approach of this reading program in your school?

   a. individually oriented, primarily *13*
   b. group oriented, primarily *0*
   c. both individual and group oriented, equally *3*
   d. Other ___

8. How effective do you feel such an approach was in improving actual reading ability?

   a. not effective *1*
   b. moderately effective *6*
   c. very effective *9*

9. How effective do you feel such an approach was in improving attitudes toward reading?

   a. not effective *1*
   b. moderately effective *7*
   c. very effective *8*

10. How comfortable were you as an individual with this approach?

   a. uncomfortable *1*
   b. moderately comfortable *1*
   c. very comfortable *14*

11. Do you feel that this course is helping students in related subjects?

   a. no, not at all *0*
   b. yes, but only very little *0*
   c. yes, to some extent *7*
   d. yes, quite a bit *8*
   e. yes, a great deal *1*

12. Now that you have experience teaching this course, how do you feel about it?

   a. it was unsuccessful this summer and, due to the framework in which you have to work, it would continue to be unsuccessful next summer. *0*
   b. it was unsuccessful this year, but could be better next summer. *0*
   c. it was successful this year and could be successful next summer. *16*
   d. Comment *Somewhat successful; Good program; Best program ever.*

13. Did you receive an adequate quantity of the prescribed materials with which to conduct the course?

   a. Yes *14*
   b. No *2*

14. How would you rate the quality of the materials which you have received?

1	2	3	4	5
bad	below average	average	above average	good
(0)	*(1)*	*(5)*	*(5)*	*(5)*

15. Did you supplement the prescribed materials with materials from other sources?

   a. Yes *14*
   b. No *2*

16. Did you find it necessary to create your own reading materials?

a. Yes 3
b. No 13

17. How many times did your coordinator or teacher trainer visit your school this summer?

a. once 0
b. twice 0
c. three time 2
d. more than three times 14

18. In total, what length of time did they spend in your school?

NA days *One visit per week*

19. Did you profit from the consultation in terms of

a. defining the goals of this particular program 11yes 1no
b. gaining skill in individualized teaching techniques 10yes 2no
c. gaining familiarization with materials 11yes 1no
d. gaining confidence and a feeling of ease with the format of the course NA = 4 12yes 0no

20. How accessible and helpful was the High School Reading Office this summer?

a. very much 14
b. so-so 2
c. not at all 0

21. Given the guidelines set for you, how would you rate this reading program?

a. very poor 0
b. below average 0
c. average 1
d. above average 7
e. very good 8

22. Would you want to participate in this program next year?

a. Yes 16
b. No 0

23. We would welcome any further comments, criticism, or suggestions you might wish to offer:

More Barnell Loft reading materials; hire experienced paraprofessiona

newspapers, paperbacks good; good program; testing overemphasized;

slow payroll!, set up time for teachers.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #09-61613

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 0 8 1 6	7 2 0	16	MAT71	776	635	141	18.2%	Withdrew or discharged from program	100
								Absent from posttest	38
								Non-English-speaking	3

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

Appendix C

3/75